

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 31, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 18 and 19 are now all of the claims pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10, 13-15, and 17 have been canceled.

**I. Rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,420,441). However, claim 10 has been canceled as indicated above. Consequently, the rejection of claim 10 is now moot.

**II. Rejection of claims 5, 6, 8, 13, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 5, 6, 8, 13, 14 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman et al. in view of Farrokhnia et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,231,231). As indicated above, claims 5, 6, 8, 13, 14 and 17 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 5, 6, 8, 13, 14 and 17 is now moot.

**III. Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner has indicated that claim 7 contains allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 7, which was dependent upon claims 5 and 6, has been rewritten

in independent form. Claim 7 represents claim 7 dependent upon claim 5/17 and claim 19 represents claim 7 dependent upon claim 6/5/17.

Claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 12 and 16 are allowed, of which claims 9, 11 and 16 are independent. The Examiner states that “the improvements comprise in combination with other recited elements: (a) detecting whether noise occurs in the form of a line in the vertical-scanning direction in the low-density region of an image reproduced from the image inspection signal, and judging that stray light has occurred if the noise occurs and that stray light has not occurred if the noise does not occur, based on the detection of the noise; and (b) repeating the disposition of a radiation shielding member on a storable fluorescent sheet and that illumination with a radiation dose that corresponds to a contrast difference, until a density pattern is obtained.”

Applicant submits that the Examiner’s reasons for allowance are not applicable to all of the independent claims. In particular, aspect (a) as stated by the Examiner, is directed to claims 9 and 16 and aspect (b) is directed to claims 7 and 11. Further, Applicant submits that the claims should be governed by the actual claim language and not by the Examiner’s reasons for allowance.

#### **IV. New Claims**

Applicant has claim 18 to provide a more varied scope of protection. Claim 18 is similar to claim 17 but clarifies that the line extends from one corner of the storable fluorescent inspection sheet to another corner of the storable fluorescent inspection sheet. Further, Applicant

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Appln. No.: 09/801,773

Attorney Docket No.: Q61192


has added claim 19 which represents the dependency of claim 7 on claim 6/5/17, rewritten in independent form..

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ruthleen E. Uy  
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 30, 2005